

Progress in Lattice Field Theory Algorithms

A. D. Kennedy*

Supercomputer Computations Research Institute
Florida State University
Tallahassee FL 32306-4052, U.S.A.

October 30, 1992

SCRI preprint FSU-SCRI-92-160
CRS4 preprint CRS4-PARCOMP-92-1
hep-lat/9212017

Abstract

I present a summary of recent algorithmic developments for lattice field theories. In particular I give a pedagogical introduction to the new Multicanonical algorithm, and discuss the relation between the Hybrid Overrelaxation and Hybrid Monte Carlo algorithms. I also attempt to clarify the rôle of the dynamical critical exponent z and its connection with “computational cost.”

*This research was supported by the Florida State University Supercomputer Computations Research Institute which is partially funded by the U.S. Department of Energy through contract #DE-FC05-85ER250000. This research has been carried out with the partial support of the Sardinia Regional Authorities. I would like to thank the University of Edinburgh and CRS4 (Cagliari) for their hospitality while this review was being written.

1 INTRODUCTION

In this review I shall concentrate on two areas in which there has been considerable work and significant progress during the last year. The first is the Multicanonical algorithm which, although the underlying ideas have been known for some time, has been successfully applied to studying many properties of first-order transitions in lattice field theories. I shall attempt to give a somewhat pedagogical introduction to this method. The second is the Hybrid Overrelaxation algorithm; this method has been used for some years, but recent analysis of its performance for the Gaussian model and of its relationship with the Hybrid Monte Carlo algorithm are illuminating.

Unfortunately there has been little activity or progress on what I consider the two outstanding algorithmic challenges facing lattice field theory today: dynamical fermions and complex actions. For the former the algorithms seem to work quite well, albeit slowly, whereas for the latter the situation is much worse.

There has been a lot of work on multigrid and cluster methods. Both have been shown to work well in some simple models (usually in two dimensions), but their efficacy has not yet been demonstrated for four dimensional non-abelian gauge theories. Since these methods were discussed in considerable detail in previous lattice conferences I shall only survey the progress very briefly here.

I shall also try to clarify the situation regarding what is known about critical slowing down for the Hybrid Monte Carlo algorithm.

2 MULTICANONICAL METHODS

Although the application of the multicanonical algorithm to lattice field theory is new [1, 2, 3], similar techniques have been used for some time [4, 5, 6]. For a recent review of developments in this subject see [7].

2.1 Marginal Distributions

A statistical mechanical system or a quantum field theory may be described not only in terms of their detailed microscopic states, but also in terms of a set of macroscopic parameters (e.g., energy, density, magnetization) which

suffice to specify all of its thermodynamic properties. We shall denote the space of microstates by $\mathcal{M}$, which has “volume” $Z \equiv \int_{\mathcal{M}} d\phi$ with respect to the natural measure $d\phi$, and we shall write $\langle \cdot \rangle_f$ to indicate an average over $\mathcal{M}$ with respect to the measure $\propto d\phi f(\phi)$. Similarly, we shall call the space of macrostates $\mathcal{O}$, with volume $Z' \equiv \int_{\mathcal{O}} dE$ and averages over this space with respect to the measure $\propto dE g(E)$ will be written as $\langle\langle \cdot \rangle\rangle_g$. If Ω is some thermodynamic observable which depends only on some macroscopic parameters $\mathcal{E}$ then the situation may be summarized by the following equation

$$\mathcal{M} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{E}} \mathcal{O} \xrightarrow{\Omega} \mathbb{R}. \quad (1)$$

Microscopic and macroscopic averages are related in a trivial way:¹

$$\langle \Omega \circ \mathcal{E} \rangle = \frac{1}{Z} \int_{\mathcal{M}} d\phi \Omega(\mathcal{E}(\phi)) \quad (2)$$

$$= \frac{1}{Z} \int_{\mathcal{M}} d\phi \int_{\mathcal{O}} dE \delta(E - \mathcal{E}(\phi)) \Omega(E) \quad (3)$$

$$= \int_{\mathcal{O}} dE \rho(E) \Omega(E) = \langle\langle \Omega \rangle\rangle_{\rho} \quad (4)$$

where we have introduced the *density of states*

$$\rho(E) \equiv \frac{1}{Z} \int_{\mathcal{M}} d\phi \delta(E - \mathcal{E}(\phi)). \quad (5)$$

The probability distribution generated by $\rho(E)$ is the *marginal distribution* on $\mathcal{O}$, meaning that it is obtained from the full distribution over the much larger space $\mathcal{M}$ by averaging over all the other variables.

2.2 Importance Sampling

Importance sampling is a fundamental technique to reduce the statistical errors in a Monte Carlo computation. Suppose we wish to measure the expectation value of some quantity $f : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$: to this end we introduce an estimator

$$E_{\mu} \left[\frac{f}{\mu} \right] = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{f(\phi_t)}{\mu(\phi_t)} \quad (6)$$

¹We use the notation $\Omega \circ \mathcal{E}$ to indicate functional composition: $(\Omega \circ \mathcal{E})(\phi) = \Omega(\mathcal{E}(\phi))$.

where samples $\{\phi_t\}$ are chosen from the distribution $\mu(\phi_t)$. It is easy to see that the expectation value $\langle E_\mu [f/\mu] \rangle_\mu = \langle f \rangle$ is independent of the choice of distribution μ ; in fact the central limit theorem tells us the stronger result that

$$E_\mu \left[\frac{f}{\mu} \right] = \langle f \rangle + O \left(\sqrt{\frac{V_\mu [f/\mu]}{T}} \right), \quad (7)$$

where the variance of a single sample is

$$V_\mu \left[\frac{f}{\mu} \right] = \left\langle \left(\frac{f}{\mu} - \left\langle \frac{f}{\mu} \right\rangle_\mu \right)^2 \right\rangle_\mu \quad (8)$$

$$= \left\langle \frac{f^2}{\mu} \right\rangle - \langle f \rangle^2. \quad (9)$$

Observe that we can reduce the error not only by increasing T but also by choosing μ so as to make $V_\mu [f/\mu]$ smaller.

We may find the optimal importance sampling by a simple variational calculation

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta}{\delta \mu} \left\{ V_\mu \left[\frac{f}{\mu} \right] + \lambda \langle \mu \rangle \right\}_{\mu=\mu_{\text{opt}}} &= \\ &= - \left\langle \frac{f^2}{\mu_{\text{opt}}^2} \right\rangle + \lambda = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The solution of this equation gives the optimal probability distribution

$$\mu_{\text{opt}} = \frac{|f|}{\langle |f| \rangle}; \quad (10)$$

this gives a variance per sample of

$$V_{\mu_{\text{opt}}} \left[\frac{f}{\mu_{\text{opt}}} \right] = \langle |f| \rangle^2 - \langle f \rangle^2, \quad (11)$$

which vanishes iff f has the same sign $\forall \phi$. While we cannot often achieve this ideal situation, generating a probability distribution which approximates the operator being measured can greatly reduce the amount of computer time necessary to get a reliable measurement of the operator's expectation value.

2.3 Canonical Distribution

In field theory as well as for statistical systems we are most often interested finding the expectation values of operators with respect to the canonical distribution. For statistical systems this distribution is obtained by maximizing the entropy $S \equiv -\langle \log P \rangle_P$ with respect to the probability distribution P subject to the constraints that the ensemble average is at a given point in $\mathcal{O}$: $\langle 1 \rangle_P = 1$, $\langle \mathcal{E} \rangle_P = E \in \mathcal{O}$.

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta P} \{S + \lambda \langle 1 \rangle_P - \beta \langle \mathcal{E} \rangle_P\}_{P=P_c} = 0 \quad (12)$$

whose solution is

$$P_c(\phi) = \frac{e^{-\beta \mathcal{E}(\phi)}}{Z(\beta)}, \quad (13)$$

with the *partition function* Z and *free energy* F given by

$$Z(\beta) = \int_{\mathcal{M}} d\phi e^{-\beta \mathcal{E}(\phi)} = e^{-\beta F(\beta)}, \quad (14)$$

and

$$E = -\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \log Z(\beta). \quad (15)$$

In terms of macroscopic averages the canonical distribution of Eq. (13) is

$$\langle \Omega \circ \mathcal{E} \rangle_{e^{-\beta \mathcal{E}}} = \langle \langle \Omega \rangle \rangle_{\rho(E)e^{-\beta E}}. \quad (16)$$

Taking configurations from the canonical distribution P_c gives good importance sampling if $\Omega(E) \approx 1$ for all E in the subspace of $\mathcal{O}$ of interest.

It is important to note that we do not know $Z(\beta)$ *a priori*, so using any other importance sampling requires the computation of ratios of estimators. A ratio of unbiased estimators is not an unbiased estimator for the ratio, so care must be taken to avoid systematic errors; as we shall see, this ought to be done for multicanonical computations.

2.4 Multicanonical Distribution

If $\Omega(E)$ has exponentially large peaks then important contributions may come from regions where $e^{-\beta E} \rho(E)$ is small. This situation is illustrated

Figure 1: A situation in which the multicanonical method is useful. The solid line is the canonical distribution and the dashed line is the operator of interest.

schematically in figure 1. A compromise to get good importance sampling simultaneously for $\Omega e^{-\beta E}$ and $e^{-\beta E}$ is to generate configurations with a uniform density on macrostate space $\mathcal{O}$. This is the *multicanonical* distribution

$$P_{\text{MC}}(\phi) \propto \frac{1}{\rho(\mathcal{E}(\phi))}. \quad (17)$$

It leads to $\langle \Omega \circ \mathcal{E} \rangle_{\frac{1}{\rho \circ \mathcal{E}}} = \langle\langle \Omega \rangle\rangle$ and

$$\langle \Omega \circ \mathcal{E} \rangle_{e^{-\beta \mathcal{E}}} = \frac{\left\langle \rho \circ \mathcal{E} e^{-\beta \mathcal{E}} \Omega \circ \mathcal{E} \right\rangle_{\frac{1}{\rho \circ \mathcal{E}}}}{\left\langle \rho \circ \mathcal{E} \Omega \circ \mathcal{E} \right\rangle_{\frac{1}{\rho \circ \mathcal{E}}}} \quad (18)$$

$$= \frac{\langle\langle \rho e^{-\beta E} \Omega \rangle\rangle}{\langle\langle \rho e^{-\beta E} \rangle\rangle}. \quad (19)$$

2.5 Algorithms to Generate the Multicanonical Distribution

If $\tilde{\rho}(E) \approx \rho(E)$ then we can readily generate an approximate multicanonical distribution

$$\tilde{P}_{\text{MC}}(\phi) \propto \frac{1}{\tilde{\rho}(\mathcal{E}(\phi))} \quad (20)$$

for which

$$\langle \Omega \circ \mathcal{E} \rangle_{e^{-\beta \mathcal{E}}} = \frac{\left\langle \tilde{\rho} \circ \mathcal{E} e^{-\beta \mathcal{E}} \Omega \circ \mathcal{E} \right\rangle_{\frac{1}{\tilde{\rho} \circ \mathcal{E}}}}{\left\langle \tilde{\rho} \circ \mathcal{E} \Omega \circ \mathcal{E} \right\rangle_{\frac{1}{\tilde{\rho} \circ \mathcal{E}}}} \quad (21)$$

$$= \frac{\langle\langle \tilde{\rho} e^{-\beta E} \Omega \rangle\rangle_{\rho/\tilde{\rho}}}{\langle\langle \tilde{\rho} e^{-\beta E} \rangle\rangle_{\rho/\tilde{\rho}}}. \quad (22)$$

This is cheap if all the macroscopic parameters $\mathcal{E}$ are local operators on $\phi \in \mathcal{M}$. We can use a Metropolis algorithm with acceptance probability

$$P(\phi \rightarrow \phi') = \min \left(1, \frac{\tilde{P}_{\text{MC}}(\phi')}{\tilde{P}_{\text{MC}}(\phi)} \right) \quad (23)$$

$$= \min \left(1, \frac{\tilde{\rho}(\mathcal{E}(\phi))}{\tilde{\rho}(\mathcal{E}(\phi'))} \right) \quad (24)$$

$$= \min \left(1, e^{-\Delta \log \tilde{\rho} \circ \mathcal{E}} \right). \quad (25)$$

Presumably it would be better to use Hybrid Monte Carlo or Hybrid Over-relaxation algorithms if they have $z \approx 1$.

For low-dimensional $\mathcal{O}$ we may represent the approximate spectral density $\log \tilde{\rho}(E)$ by binning. Berg and Neuhaus used a piecewise linear interpolation (canonical within each bin)

$$\log \tilde{\rho}(E) = \sum_{j=1}^N \chi_j(E)(\beta_j E + \alpha_j) \quad (26)$$

$[\chi_j(E)$ is the characteristic function of bin j : it has the value 1 if E is in the bin and 0 otherwise], whereas Marinari and Parisi use a stochastic superposition of equiprobable linear interpolations (each term canonical)

$$\tilde{\rho}(E) = \sum_{j=1}^N P_j(\beta_j E + \alpha_j) \quad (27)$$

$[P_j$ is the probability of choosing term j from the “sum”]. The former is illustrated in figure 2.

2.6 Applications

There have been many calculations making use of the multicanonical method during the last year, including [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16]. We shall just consider two very simple examples in which it is effective:

- The surface energy at a first order phase transition, and
- The autocorrelation time (tunnelling time) at a first order phase transition.

The surface energy may be defined by

$$\frac{P_{\max}}{P_{\min}} = 2F_{\text{surface}} L^{D-1} \quad (L \rightarrow \infty), \quad (28)$$

where $P_{\min}$ and $P_{\max}$ are illustrated in figure 3. In order to relate this to our formal analysis the appropriate operators may be expressed as

$$P_{\min} = \lim_{\gamma \rightarrow \pm\infty} \frac{1}{\gamma} \log \langle\langle e^{\gamma P} \rangle\rangle; \quad (29)$$

Figure 2: A piecewise linear approximation to $\log \rho$.

Figure 3: Schematic surface energy calculation.

these operators are shown (for some large but finite value of γ) with dashed lines in figure 3. The lack of overlap between the operator giving $P_{\min}$ and the canonical distribution is obviously an example of the situation shown in figure 1. For this reason it is clear why this operator will be sampled much better by the multicanonical algorithm, which will generate configurations of energy E uniformly distributed over the range of interest.

The autocorrelation time (tunnelling time) for local Monte Carlo algorithms at a first order phase transition is notoriously long. The problem here is that any local algorithm requires the system to pass through the minimum separating the two phases (figure 4), so the tunnelling time is approximately proportional to $P_{\min}$. Since the logarithm of the density of states is an extensive quantity

$$\log \rho(E) \propto L^D \quad (30)$$

where L^D is the lattice volume, it follows that

$$\tau_A \propto P_{\min} \propto e^{-\Delta L^D}, \quad (31)$$

where Δ is the error in the approximation for $\log \rho(E)$ at any fixed volume. For a true multicanonical distribution $\Delta = 0$, and for an approximate one it is at least much smaller than the canonical barrier, as shown in figure 4.

2.7 Open Questions

While the multicanonical method works very well in practice, there are still several interesting algorithmic questions about it which ought to be addressed.

- For a fixed $\tilde{\rho}(E)$ the autocorrelation time τ_A is still exponential in L^D , but with a much smaller exponent. This follows simply from equation (31).
- We can measure $\rho(E)$ during the course of a multicanonical computation by counting the number of configurations landing in each bin, and it can be used to improve the approximation $\tilde{\rho}(E)$.
- Just as for simulated annealing, however, no one has given an *algorithm* for evolving $\tilde{\rho}(E)$. In order to do this one would have to address the following issues:

Figure 4: Another situation in which the multicanonical method is useful; the canonical distribution at a first-order phase transition.

- How do we distinguish a statistically significant difference between ρ and $\tilde{\rho}$ from fluctuations?
- How do we ensure stability, and that $\tilde{\rho} \rightarrow \rho$?
- The number of bins must presumably grow as L^D to avoid an exponential autocorrelation time, yet there must be sufficient statistics in each bin to give a significant estimate for $\tilde{\rho}$.
- Is there an algorithm giving a power-law volume dependence for τ_A ?
- Do we care? In practical simulations we might not mind having an exponential algorithm provided that the exponent was small enough. We might even prefer it to a polynomial algorithm with a large coefficient.

3 HYBRID OVERRELAXATION

The name “Hybrid Overrelaxation” appears to have been coined by Wolff [17] who recently analyzed the dynamical critical behaviour of this algorithm in the Gaussian model. The algorithm, however, has been used in a variety of models over the past few years [18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27]. It belongs to a class of overrelaxed algorithms introduced by Adler [28] with dynamical critical exponent $z \approx 1$ for the Gaussian model [29, 30, 31].

3.1 Adler Overrelaxation

Consider the Gaussian model defined by the free field action

$$S(\phi) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_x \left\{ \sum_{\mu=1}^D (\partial_\mu \phi(x))^2 + m^2 \phi(x)^2 \right\}. \quad (32)$$

A single-site Adler overrelaxation (AOR) update [28] with parameter ζ replaces $\phi(x)$ by

$$\phi'(x) = (1 - \zeta)\phi(x) + \frac{\zeta \mathcal{F}}{\omega^2} + \frac{\sqrt{\zeta(2 - \zeta)}}{\omega} \eta, \quad (33)$$

where $\omega^2 \equiv 2D + m^2$ is the square of the highest frequency in the spectrum, the “force” on $\phi(x)$ due to its neighbours is $\mathcal{F} \equiv \sum_{|x-y|=1} \phi(y)$, and η is a Gaussian-distributed random number.

3.2 $z = 1$ for Gaussian Model

The lattice may be updated using a checkerboard scheme, alternating the update of all even and all odd sites. This is just a consequence of the locality of the action. This is also the basis of Wolff’s [17] analysis of the dynamical critical behaviour of overrelaxation in the Gaussian model: the fields on the even and odd sublattices can Fourier transformed, and equation (33) becomes block diagonal in momentum space. Determining the autocorrelations of the method thus reduce to studying the eigenvalues of a 2×2 matrix.

Let us now consider two special cases of the Adler overrelaxation algorithm, corresponding to different values of ζ . For $\zeta = 1$ this is the heatbath (HB) algorithm, because $\phi'(x)$ does not depend upon $\phi(x)$. The exponential autocorrelation time is

$$\tau_{\text{HB}} = \frac{D}{m^2 + p^2} \quad (p^2 \rightarrow 0), \quad (34)$$

which corresponds to $z = 2$. If we adjust ζ so as to minimize the autocorrelation time we find that

$$\zeta = 2 - \frac{2m}{\sqrt{D}} + O(m^2), \quad \tau_{\text{AOR}} \approx \frac{\sqrt{D}}{2m}; \quad (35)$$

which gives $z = 1$.

3.3 Hybrid Overrelaxation

For $\zeta = 2$ the new field value, $\phi'(x)$, does not depend on the noise η , so the update is not ergodic. The Hybrid Overrelaxation (HOR) algorithm cures this by alternating N AOR steps with a single HB step. Minimizing the autocorrelation time requires increasing $N \propto 1/m$, which leads to $\tau_{\text{HOR}} = 1$.

Just as pointed out by Weingarten and Mackenzie [32, 33] for Hybrid Monte Carlo (HMC), N should be varied randomly around this value to avoid accidental non-ergodicity; although this is probably only a problem for the Gaussian model and not for interacting field theories.

3.4 Overrelaxation and Hybrid Monte Carlo

I now want to show that the HOR algorithm — and the AOR algorithm too — are closely related to the HMC algorithm. To this end let us consider the HMC algorithm applied to the Gaussian model: we introduce the Hamiltonian

$$H(\pi, \phi) = \frac{1}{2}\pi^2 + S(\phi) \quad (36)$$

on “fictitious” phase space. The corresponding equation of motion is

$$\ddot{\phi}_x = -\omega^2 \phi_x + \mathcal{F}, \quad (37)$$

whose solution in terms of the Gaussian distributed random initial momentum π_x and the initial field value ϕ_x is

$$\phi_x(t) = \phi_x \cos \omega t + \frac{1 - \cos \omega t}{\omega^2} \mathcal{F} + \frac{\pi_x}{\omega} \sin \omega t, \quad (38)$$

which is exactly the AOR update considered before if we identify $\zeta \equiv 1 - \cos \omega t$. If we use this exact solution of the equations of motion to generate candidate configurations for HMC then the acceptance rate will be unity. For interacting field theories HMC provides an exact algorithm for any value of the overrelaxation parameter ζ simply by dropping the interaction terms in the action and solving the equations of motion exactly for the resulting Gaussian model.

Let us summarize the differences between this variant of the HMC algorithm and the usual one. For “conventional” HMC:

- All sites are updated at once;
- Each trajectory is of length $\tau \propto 1/m$ and is a sequence of many steps of length $\delta\tau$;
- There is a *global* Metropolis accept/reject step.

For “local” HMC [34, 35, 36]:

- Even and odd updates are alternated;
- Each trajectory is of length $\tau \approx \pi/\omega = O(1)$;
- There is a *local* Metropolis accept/reject step.

3.5 Leapfrog vs. Free Field Guidance

It is important to realize that there are two separate issues; one is whether a global accept/reject step is used, the other is whether an exact solution to the free-field equations of motion or an approximate (leapfrog) solution to the true equations of motion is used.

- Local Metropolis acceptance/rejection:
 - Useful only for local (bosonic) theories;
 - Acceptance rate does not depend on the lattice volume.
- Free-field instead of leapfrog guidance:
 - Leapfrog has $\delta\tau$ errors so $P_{acc} < 1$ even for free field theory;
 - Free field guidance has errors of order λ for interacting theories, whereas leapfrog has errors of order $\lambda\delta\tau^2$, where λ is the coupling constant of the interaction part of the action.

4 DYNAMICAL CRITICAL EXPONENTS

Let us begin this topic by recalling the definition of the *dynamical critical exponent* z . It relates a “dynamical” property of the algorithm generating field configurations, the autocorrelation time τ_A (either the exponential autocorrelation time or an integrated autocorrelation time will do), and a “static” property of the underlying field theory, the correlation length ξ :

$$\tau_A \propto \xi^z \quad (\xi \rightarrow \infty). \quad (39)$$

One of the main “selling points” of algorithms is that they reduce ($z \approx 1$) or even eliminate ($z \approx 0$) critical slowing down from the value ($z \approx 2$) characteristic of “random walk” methods. In general terms it is possible to reduce z from 2 to 1 by using just the right amount of randomness in the algorithm (see sections 3.2 and 4.2), whereas further reduction of z seems [31] to require an algorithm with more specific “knowledge” of the dynamics of the theory (section 5).

Although the theoretical analysis of critical slowing down is usually limited to the Gaussian model, this is relevant because an algorithm is often better just because it is not quite so dumb in dealing with free fields. How close real theories are to free fields is an empirical question: for some interacting field theories the values of z have been determined empirically [37, 38, 39, 40, 41].

4.1 Do we care too much about z ?

The characterization of algorithms by their dynamical critical exponent has perhaps been somewhat over-emphasized. Care is required not only because our computations are not always performed at parameters where the asymptotic behaviour of the algorithms has set in, but also because the cost of a computation is not just given by the autocorrelation time.

We want to study the continuum limit (critical behaviour) of some lattice model in a large enough box (thermodynamic limit). In order that the systematic errors are under control we need to match both the short and long distance behaviour of the lattice regularization to some analytic form:

- For asymptotically free theories we hope we can match the $\xi/a \rightarrow \infty$ scaling to perturbation theory.
- Non-perturbative effects fall off exponentially fast in UV asymptopia.
- For non asymptotically free theories it is unclear how we can verify that a is small enough.
- We hope to match results using finite size scaling for $L/\xi \rightarrow \infty$.

We only need to carry out numerical computations for an essentially finite range of lattice spacings. Good asymptotic dynamical scaling behaviour of an algorithm is useful only if

- scaling sets in for the lattice sizes we are interested in,
- the coefficient in equation (39) is small.

4.2 Critical Slowing Down and Finite

Size Scaling

Our definition of z (equation (39)) assumes $L \gg \xi$, which is usually the case for lattice gauge theory computations. If we want to study finite size scaling computations are sometimes done in the regime $L \ll \xi$, and the dynamical critical exponent is defined by $\tau_A \propto L^z$ [42]. It is not clear that the definitions are equivalent if some parameters have to be tuned to values depending upon ξ , e.g., $\tau \propto \xi$ in HMC. For HMC in the Gaussian model with $L \gg \xi$, $z = 2$ if $\tau = \text{constant}$, and $z = 1$ if $\tau \propto \xi$ [43, 44]. If $\xi \gg L$ then $z = 2$ for $\tau = \text{constant}$, but I know of no analysis for any other cases.

4.3 Computational Cost

For the global HMC algorithm z is not the whole story; the computational cost explicitly depends on the lattice volume even at fixed ξ [45, 46]

$$T_{\text{comp}} \propto V^{5/4} = L^{5D/4} \quad (40)$$

because the integration step size $\delta\tau$ has to be reduced so as to keep the Metropolis acceptance rate constant. It must be remembered that $T_{\text{comp}} \propto V$ is true even for local algorithms (one has to look at every site!). For higher-order leapfrog schemes this cost can be reduced to $T_{\text{comp}} \propto V^{1+\epsilon}$ (an interesting new way of understanding these higher-order algorithms is presented in [47]).

Before leaving this subject I would like to mention a couple of related topics. First, some interesting results on the scaling behaviour of HMC in the presence of dynamical fermions are presented in [48, 49]. Second, an interesting variant of HMC which adds a small amount of randomness to the momenta at each integration step (instead of a complete momentum refreshment after an entire trajectory) was found by Horowitz [50]. Unfortunately, the deterministic part of the momenta has to have its sign flipped after every step in order to satisfy the detailed balance condition, and this means the modified algorithm does not perform any better (although a detailed proof has not yet been presented).

5 MULTIGRID AND

CLUSTER METHODS

I mentioned previously that algorithms which have $z < 1$ appear to require some knowledge of the detailed dynamics of the model being simulated. For some spin models this is achieved in a non-trivial manner by cluster algorithms, but for lattice gauge theories like QCD all attempts in this direction are motivated by free field theory dynamics. This is not a bad idea, because such theories are asymptotically free. There has not been much activity in the area of Fourier acceleration, but there has been a great deal of work on Multigrid methods. Since such methods were reviewed in detail last year I shall merely survey work in this area extremely briefly.

Grabenstein and Pinn have presented a formalism for computing the acceptance rate for Multigrid Monte Carlo [51, 52]. There have been numerous applications and tests of multigrid methods, including those of Hasenbusch and Meyer [53, 54, 25] (strictly speaking these are really “unigrid” algorithms), Laursen and Vink [55], and Edwards *et al.* [56].

Multigrid methods are also under active study as a means of inverting the lattice Dirac operator more efficiently [57, 58, 59, 60, 61]. Another method used for this purpose has been proposed by Vyas [62, 63]. Whether these techniques can significantly outperform the conjugate gradient algorithm is not yet settled.

Multigrid methods have also been used to expedite gauge fixing [64] (see also the work of van der Sijs [65]).

Cluster algorithms have also been under active study. An interesting way of understanding them has been suggested by Wolff [66]. Their area of applicability is still mainly for spin models of various kinds [67, 68] where they are extremely successful and are often the clear method of choice. Nevertheless, their use is limited to models whose spin manifold possesses an involutive isometry whose fixed point manifold has codimension one (i.e., a discrete quotient of a product of spheres), as was shown by Sokal and collaborators [69]. B. Bunk [70] describes a cluster algorithm which is applicable to $\mathbb{Z}(2)$ gauge theory.

The parallelism inherent in FFT, multigrid, and cluster algorithms is more complex than the simple grid-like structure needed for the algorithms discussed in previous sections (they require only nearest-neighbour communication with infrequent global summations). The implementation of cluster algorithms on parallel and vector computers has been discussed in several

papers [71, 72, 73]. In the future it will be interesting to characterize these algorithms in terms of the type of communications network required to implement them efficiently on a parallel computer (e.g., combining networks, infinite dimensional grids, etc.).

6 OTHER ALGORITHMS

There are, of course, numerous interesting results which I have not had time or space to discuss in detail. I do wish to mention at least a few of them here, so that the interested reader will be able to refer to the original literature.

An interesting algorithm called “microcanonical cluster Monte Carlo” was introduced by Creutz [74]. This algorithm allows a discrete spin variable to interact with a heat bath (provided by a family of “demons”), and for the demon energies to be refreshed occasionally. In some ways this method is a discrete analogue of the HMC method.

Sloan, Kusnezov, and Bulgac [41] introduce a “chaotic molecular dynamics” algorithm, which couples chaotic degrees of freedom to a system to ensure ergodicity (instead of, or perhaps as well as, refreshing the fictitious momenta of the Hybrid algorithm). Neal [75] suggests a new procedure which may serve to increase the acceptance rate of the HMC algorithm. Finally, Bhanot and Adler [76] describe a parallel algorithm for updating spin models.

References

- [1] Bernd A. Berg and Thomas Neuhaus. Multicanonical algorithms for first order phase transitions. *Phys. Lett.*, B267:249–253, 1991.
- [2] Bernd A. Berg and Thomas Neuhaus. Multicanonical ensemble: a new approach to simulate first order phase transitions. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 68:9–12, 1992.
- [3] Enzo Marinari and Giorgio Parisi. Simulated Tempering: A new Monte Carlo scheme. *Europhys. Lett.*, 19:451–458, 1992.
- [4] G. M. Torrie and J. P. Valleau. *J. Comp. Phys.*, 23:187, 1977.
- [5] I. S. Graham and J. P. Valleau. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 94:7894, 1990.

- [6] J. P. Valleau. *J. Comp. Phys.*, 96:193, 1991.
- [7] Bernd Berg. The multicanonical ensemble: a new approach to computer simulations. Technical report, FSU, August 1992. FSU-HEP-92-0817.
- [8] Ulli Hansmann Bernd A. Berg and Thomas Neuhaus. Recent results of multimagnetical simulations of the Ising model. Technical report, SCRI, July 1992. FSU-SCRI-92C-87.
- [9] Bernd A. Berg and Tarik Celik. A new approach to spin glass simulations. Technical report, SCRI, April 1992. FSU-SCRI-92-58.
- [10] Bernd A. Berg. Multicanonical Potts model simulations. Technical report, Universität Bielefeld, 1991. BI-TP-91-21.
- [11] Bernd A. Berg, Tarik Celik, and Ulrich Hansmann. Multicanonical study of the 3-d Ising spin glass. Technical report, SCRI, September 1992. FSU-SCRI-92-121.
- [12] Bernd A. Berg and Tarik Celik. Multicanonical spin glass simulations. Technical report, July 1992. PRINT-92-0295.
- [13] Wolfram Janke, Bernd A. Berg, and Mohammad Katoot. Monte Carlo calculation of the surface free energy for the 2-d seven state Potts model and an estimate for 4-d $SU(3)$ gauge theory. Technical report, SCRI, February 1992. FSU-SCRI-92-40.
- [14] Alain Billoire. Numerical study of finite size scaling for first order phase transitions. Technical report, Saclay, June 1992. SPHT-92-097.
- [15] B. Grossmann, M. L. Laursen, T. Trappenberg, and U.-J. Wiese. A multicanonical algorithm and the surface free energy in $SU(3)$ pure gauge theory. Technical report, HLRZ, 1992. HLRZ-92-31.
- [16] B. Grossmann, M. L. Laursen, T. Trappenberg, and U.-J. Wiese. The confined-deconfined interface tension and the spectrum of the transfer matrix. Technical report, HLRZ, 1992. HLRZ-92-47.
- [17] Ulli Wolff. Dynamics of Hybrid Overrelaxation in the Gaussian model. *Phys. Lett.*, B288:166-170, 1992.

- [18] Michael Creutz. Monte Carlo algorithms for lattice gauge theory. *Phys. Rev.*, D36:515, 1987.
- [19] Frank R. Brown and Thomas J. Woch. Overrelaxed heat bath and Metropolis algorithms for accelerating pure gauge Monte Carlo calculations. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 58:2394, 1987.
- [20] Rajan Gupta, Jerry DeLapp, George G. Batrouni, Geoffrey C. Fox, Clive F. Baillie, and John Apostolakis. The phase transition in the 2-D XY model. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 61:1996, 1988.
- [21] Rajan Gupta, Gregory W. Kilcup, Apoorva Patel, Stephen R. Sharpe, and Philippe de Forcrand. Comparison of update algorithms for pure gauge $SU(3)$. *Mod. Phys. Lett.*, A3:1367–1378, 1988.
- [22] Karsten M. Decker and Philippe de Forcrand. Pure $SU(2)$ lattice gauge theory on 32^4 lattices. In Nicola Cabibbo, Enzo Marinari, Giorgio Parisi, Roberto Petronzio, Luciano Maiani, Guido Martinelli, and Roberto Petronzio, editors, *Lattice '89*, volume B17 of *Nuclear Physics (Proceedings Supplements)*, pages 567–570, 1990. Proceedings of the 1989 Symposium on Lattice Field Theory, Capri, Italy, 18–21 September 1989.
- [23] John Apostolakis, Clive F. Baillie, and Geoffrey C. Fox. In Heller et al. [78], page 678. Proceedings of the International Conference on Lattice Field Theory, Tallahassee, Florida, USA, 8–12 October 1990.
- [24] John Apostolakis, Clive F. Baillie, and Geoffrey C. Fox. Investigation of the two-dimensional $O(3)$ model using the overrelaxation algorithm. *Phys. Rev.*, D43:2687–2693, 1991.
- [25] Martin Hasenbusch and Steffen Meyer. Testing accelerated algorithms in the lattice CP^3 model. *Phys. Rev.*, D45:4376–4380, 1992.
- [26] Ulli Wolff. Scaling topological charge in the CP^3 spin model. *Phys. Lett.*, B284:94–98, 1992.
- [27] UKQCD Collaboration. Towards the continuum limit of $SU(2)$ lattice gauge theory. *Phys. Lett.*, B275:424–428, 1992.

- [28] Stephen L. Adler. An Overrelaxation method for the Monte Carlo evaluation of the partition function for multiquadratic actions. *Phys. Rev.*, D23:2901, 1981.
- [29] Stephen L. Adler. Overrelaxation algorithms for lattice field theories. *Phys. Rev.*, D37:458, 1988.
- [30] Herbert Neuberger. Adler’s overrelaxation algorithm for Goldstone bosons. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 59:1877, 1987.
- [31] Georgios Bathas and Herbert Neuberger. A possible barrier at $z \approx 1$ for local algorithms. *Phys. Rev.*, D45:3880–3883, 1992.
- [32] Don Weingarten. Monte Carlo algorithms for QCD. In Kronfeld and Mackenzie [79]. Proceedings of the 1988 Symposium on Lattice Field Theory, Fermilab.
- [33] Paul B. Mackenzie. An improved Hybrid Monte Carlo method. *Phys. Lett.*, B226:369, 1989.
- [34] Pietro Rossi. Study of local Hybrid Monte Carlo for $SU(3)$ lattice gauge theory. Private Communication, 1992.
- [35] Steffen Meyer, Brian Pendleton, and Christine Davies. Phase structure of the $SU(2)$ sector of the standard model. In Z. Horvath, L. Palla, and A. Patkós, editors, *Frontiers in Nonperturbative Field Theory*, page 106. World Scientific, 1989. Eger, Hungary, 18–23 August 1988.
- [36] Brian Pendleton. $SU(2)$ Higgs models with dynamical fermions at zero and finite temperature. In Kronfeld and Mackenzie [79], page 82. Proceedings of the 1988 Symposium on Lattice Field Theory, Fermilab.
- [37] Khalil M. Bitar, Robert G. Edwards, Urs M. Heller, and A. D. Kennedy. On the dynamics of light quarks in QCD. Technical Report FSU–SCRI–92C–161, SCRI, October 1992.
- [38] Sourendu Gupta. Dynamical critical properties of the Hybrid Monte Carlo algorithm. *Nucl. Phys.*, B370:741–761, 1992.

- [39] Sourendu Gupta. Dynamical properties of the Hybrid Monte Carlo algorithm. In Fukugita et al. [77], page 617. Proceedings of the International Symposium on Lattice Field Theory, Tsukuba, Japan, 5–9 November 1991.
- [40] Alessandro Vaccarino. Comparison of exact Hybrid and Langevin algorithms for QCD with Kogut-Susskind fermions. *Phys. Rev.*, D44:3254–3257, 1991.
- [41] John Sloan, Dimitri Kusnezov, and Aurel Bulgac. A test of the chaotic molecular dynamics algorithm in the XY model. Technical report, Ohio State University, 1992. YCTP–N1–92.
- [42] Bernhard Mehlig, A. L. C. Ferreira, and Dieter W. Heermann. Critical dynamics of the Hybrid Monte Carlo algorithm. 1992.
- [43] A. D. Kennedy and Brian J. Pendleton. Acceptances and autocorrelations in Hybrid Monte Carlo. In Heller et al. [78], pages 118–121. Talk presented at “Lattice ’90,” Tallahassee.
- [44] A. D. Kennedy and Brian J. Pendleton. Some exact results for Hybrid Monte Carlo. In preparation, 1992.
- [45] Michael Creutz. Global Monte Carlo algorithms for many fermion systems. *Phys. Rev.*, D38(4):1228–1238, August 1988.
- [46] Rajan Gupta, Gregory W. Kilcup, and Stephen R. Sharpe. Tuning the Hybrid Monte Carlo algorithm. *Phys. Rev.*, D38(4):1278–1287, August 1988.
- [47] J. C. Sexton and D. H. Weingarten. Hamiltonian evolution for the Hybrid Monte Carlo algorithm. *Nucl. Phys.*, B380:665–678, March 1992.
- [48] Sourendu Gupta, Anders Irbäck, Frithjof Karsch, and Bengt Petersson. The acceptance probability in the Hybrid Monte Carlo method. *Phys. Lett.*, B242:437–443, 1990.
- [49] Sourendu Gupta. Acceptance and autocorrelation in Hybrid Monte Carlo. *Int. J. Mod. Phys.*, C3:43–52, 1992.

- [50] Alan M. Horowitz. A generalized guided Monte Carlo algorithm. *Phys. Lett.*, B268:247–252, 1991.
- [51] Martin Grabenstein and Klaus Pinn. Acceptance rates in multigrid Monte Carlo. *Phys. Rev.*, D45:4372, 1992.
- [52] Martin Grabenstein and Klaus Pinn. Kinematics of multigrid Monte Carlo. Technical report, DESY, 1992. DESY-92-094.
- [53] Martin Hasenbusch and Steffen Meyer. Multigrid acceleration for asymptotically free theories. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 68:435–438, 1992.
- [54] Martin Hasenbusch, Steffen Meyer, and G. Mack. Noncritical multigrid Monte Carlo: $O(3)$ nonlinear σ model. In Heller et al. [78], page 110. Proceedings of the International Conference on Lattice Field Theory, Tallahassee, Florida, USA, 8–12 October 1990.
- [55] M. L. Laursen and Jeroen C. Vink. Multigrid updating of the compact $U(1)$ gauge fields in four dimensions. Technical report, HLRZ, March 1992. HLRZ-92-14.
- [56] R. G. Edwards, S. J. Ferreira, J. Goodman, and A. D. Sokal. Multigrid Monte Carlo. III. Two-dimensional $O(4)$ -symmetric nonlinear sigma model. *Nucl. Phys.*, B380:612–664, 1992.
- [57] Thomas Kalkreuter. Improving multigrid and conventional relaxation algorithms for propagators. Technical report, DESY, 1992. DESY-92-108.
- [58] Arjan Hulsebos, Jan Smit, and Jeroen C. Vink. Multigrid inversion of lattice fermion operators. *Nucl. Phys.*, B368:379–389, 1992.
- [59] R. Ben-Av, A. Brandt, M. Harnatz, E. Katznelson, P.G. Lauwers, S. Solomon, and K. Wolowesky. Fermion simulations using parallel transported multigrid. *Phys. Lett.*, B253:185–192, 1991.
- [60] P. G. Lauwers, R. Ben-Av, and S. Solomon. Inverting the Dirac matrix for $SU(2)$ lattice gauge theory by means of parallel transported multigrid. *Nucl. Phys.*, B374:249–262, 1992.

- [61] P. G. Lauwers and T. Wittlich. Inversion of the fermion matrix in lattice QCD by means of Parallel-Transported Multigrid (PTMG). Technical report, Universität Bonn, September 1992. BONN-92-29.
- [62] Vikram Vyas. A multigrid algorithm for calculating fermionic propagators using Migdal-Kadanoff transformation. Technical report, Universität Wuppertal, 1991. WUB-91-10.
- [63] Vikram Vyas. An efficient algorithm for calculating the quark propagators using Migdal-Kadanoff transformation. Technical Report WUB-92-30, Universität Wuppertal, September 1992.
- [64] Arjan Hulsebos, M. L. Laursen, and Jan Smit. $SU(N)$ multigrid Landau gauge fixing. *Phys. Lett.*, B291:431-436, 1992.
- [65] Arjan J. van der Sijs. Gauge invariant extremization on the lattice. Technical report, Oxford University, 1992. OUTP-92-16P.
- [66] Ulli Wolff. Cluster algorithms for nonlinear σ models. *Int. J. Mod. Phys.*, C3:213-219, 1992.
- [67] Hans Gerd Evertz, Matrin Hasenbusch, Mihail Marcu, Klaus Pinn, and Sorin Solomon. Cluster algorithms for surfaces. *Int. J. Mod. Phys.*, C3:235, 1992.
- [68] Hans Gerd Evertz, Gideon Lana, and Mihai Marcu. Cluster algorithm for vertex models. Technical report, SCRI, August 1992.
- [69] Sergio Caracciolo, Robert G. Edwards, Andrea Pelissetto, and Alan D. Sokal. Wolff-type embedding algorithms for general nonlinear σ -models. Technical report, SCRI, 1992. FSU-SCRI-92-65.
- [70] B. Bunk. An efficient algorithm for cluster updates in $Z(2)$ lattice gauge theories. Technical report, Universität Bielefeld, 1992. BI-TP-91-22.
- [71] Mike Flanigan and Pablo Tamayo. A parallel cluster labeling method for Monte Carlo dynamics. Technical report, Thinking Machines, August 1992. 92-0339.
- [72] Pietro Rossi and G. P. Tecchiolli. Finding clusters in a parallel environment. 1992.

- [73] Hans Gerd Evertz. Vectorized cluster search. In Fukugita et al. [77], pages 620–622. Proceedings of the International Symposium on Lattice Field Theory, Tsukuba, Japan, 5–9 November 1991.
- [74] Michael Creutz. Microcanonical cluster Monte Carlo. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 69:1002–1005, 1992.
- [75] Radford M. Neal. An improved acceptance procedure for the Hybrid Monte Carlo algorithm. Technical report, Toronto, July 1992. Print–92–0346.
- [76] Gyan Bhanot and Stephen L. Adler. Parallel acceleration algorithm for spin models. Technical report, IAS Princeton, 1991. IASSNS–HEP–91–90.
- [77] M. Fukugita, Y. Iwasaki, M. Okawa, and A. Ukawa, editors. volume B26 of *Nuclear Physics (Proceedings Supplements)*, 1992. Proceedings of the International Symposium on Lattice Field Theory, Tsukuba, Japan, 5–9 November 1991.
- [78] Urs M. Heller, A. D. Kennedy, and Sergiu Sanielevici, editors. volume B20 of *Nuclear Physics (Proceedings Supplements)*, 1991. Proceedings of the International Conference on Lattice Field Theory, Tallahassee, Florida, USA, 8–12 October 1990.
- [79] Andreas S. Kronfeld and Paul B. Mackenzie, editors. volume B9 of *Nuclear Physics (Proceedings Supplements)*, 1989. Proceedings of the 1988 Symposium on Lattice Field Theory, Fermilab.